



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

wholly in private and by individuals, the argument as to the untrustworthy nature of parol evidence fails. Again, there are not the safeguards against fraud and mistake which the very number of the legislature affords, while the chances of mishandling are greatly increased. Hence it is submitted that the public policy in favor of stability is overborne by the desirability of making it possible to remedy a negligent or fraudulent thwarting of the legislative will by individuals beyond the supervision of that body. Still the weight of authority supports the principal case. *Weeks v. Smith*, 81 Me. 538, 18 Atl. 325. See *People v. McCullough*, 210 Ill. 488, 510, 71 N. E. 602, 609.

EVIDENCE — TESTIMONY GIVEN AT FORMER TRIAL — ADMISSIBILITY AFTER MARRIAGE OF WITNESS WITH DEFENDANT. — In a trial for manslaughter, the former testimony of a woman who since the first trial had been disqualified by marriage with the defendant, was excluded. *Held*, that the exclusion was correct. *Langham v. State*, 68 So. 504 (Ala.)

As a general rule, former testimony is admissible as an exception to the Hearsay Rule when it has become unfeasible to secure the presence in court of the witness. *People v. Elliott*, 172 N. Y. 146, 64 N. E. 837; *State v. Wheat*, 111 La. 860, 35 So. 955; *United States v. Reynolds*, 1 Utah 319, 98 U. S. 145. The principle of this exception would make former testimony admissible in all cases where the witness, although capable of attendance in court, has been rendered incompetent, unless the incompetence were of such a nature as to cast suspicion upon the former testimony, e. g., conviction for an infamous crime. See 2 WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, § 1402. Cf. *Le Baron v. Crombie*, 14 Mass. 233. As yet, the principle has only been applied when the incompetence is for interest or mental incapacity. *Wafer v. Hemken*, 9 Rob. (La.) 203. See *Walkup v. Commonwealth*, 14 Ky. L. R. 337, 338, 20 S. W. 221, 222. See 2 WIGMORE, EVIDENCE, §§ 1408, 1409. Cf. *Gold v. Eddy*, 1 Mass. 1. Nevertheless, where the absence or incompetence has been caused by the proponent, the former testimony should be excluded on account of the danger of allowing the proponent to substitute it for direct evidence. When, however, the act of the proponent is as free from the suspicion of ulterior motives as marriage, this danger seems negligible and an inadequate ground for refusing the former testimony.

INJUNCTION — ACTS ENJOINED — INTEREST OF PERSONALITY CREATED BY STATUTE — EXCLUSIVENESS OF STATUTORY REMEDY. — Plaintiff, a dramatic critic in New York City, was excluded from defendant's theaters, and threatened with future exclusion, on the ground of unfair criticism. A New York statute provides that all persons are entitled to equal accommodations in theaters and other places of amusement, and makes discrimination by theater managers a misdemeanor, further providing that a party aggrieved may have a civil action to recover a penalty. Plaintiff asked that defendant be enjoined from violating this statute. *Held*, that an injunction will not be granted. *Woollcott v. Shubert*, 154 N. Y. Supp. 643.

For a discussion of this case, see NOTES, p. 93.

INSURANCE — RE-INSURANCE — LIABILITY OF RE-INSURER WHEN INSURER COMPROMISES. — The plaintiff, the insurer of a ship, re-insured the risk with the defendant. After loss, the plaintiff compromised with the shipowner for less than the insured value of the ship. He now sues the defendant for the full amount of the re-insurance policy. *Held*, that he can recover only the actual amount paid by him to the insured. *British, etc. Ins. Co. v. Duder*, 31 T. L. R. 361.

It is generally held that the re-insured can recover before any payment has been made to the insured, and that then subsequent events cannot alter his liability. *Hone v. Mutual, etc. Ins. Co.*, 1 Sandf. (N. Y.) 137. In the light of this, courts have generally said that re-insurance is indemnity against the